

REMARKS/COMMENTS

The enclosed is responsive to the Examiner's Office Action mailed on December 26, 2007. At the time the Examiner mailed the Office Action claims 1-12 and 14-20 were pending. By way of the present response the Applicants have: 1) amended the specification without adding any new matter; 2) amended claims 1, 9, 14 and 19; 3) added one new claim 21; and 4) argued the patentability of the Applicants' independent claim 1, 9, and 14. As such, claims 1-12 and 14-20 are now pending. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the following arguments and remarks.

The undersigned appreciates the Examiner for the careful review of the application. The Examiner is also appreciated for the courtesy extended to the undersigned during the telephonic interview on January 10, 2008. This amendment includes modifications to the claims based on the discussion and input received from the Examiner.

Specification

In the Office Action mailed on December 26, 2007, the Office objected to the specification. The Applicants have made necessary modifications without adding new matter in the specification to comply with the objection. Therefore, the Office is requested to withdraw the objections to the specification.

In paragraph [0036], term “JTC” is replaced by “application on the server side”. The support for this amendment is found on page 16 lines 17-19 in U.S. Patent Application No. 10/104,267, which is incorporate in the present application by reference.

To achieve the foregoing, a communication framework API is provided to enable communication between the client application (carlet) 502 and an application on the server side over a logical connection by selecting the most appropriate, or most efficient communication channel as dictated by a policy.

- Application No. 10/104,267, page 16, lines 17-20

In paragraph [0047], the sentence consisting of “%” symbol has been deleted. Since, the deleted sentence provided an example of display optimization, which is also discussed in the other sentences in the same paragraph, the Applicants believe that this deletion does not add any new matter.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112 1st paragraph

In the Office Action mailed on December 26, 2007, claims 1-12 and 14-20 were rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

Claims have been modified to rectify indefiniteness, as pointed out by the Examiner, in the claims. The Office is requested to withdraw the rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

As discussed during the telephonic interview on January 10, 2008, claims have been amended to include the following subject matter:

The carlet applications are executing in the telematics client and the user interface associated with the carlet applications is being displayed and managed by the draw manager. Further, the carlet applications are in communication with the applications executing in the telematics server and the data is being received in the application buffers in the telematics client from the applications executing in the telematics server via the carlet applications executing in the telematics client.

The support for this subject matter can be found:

1. Figure 4 of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/104,267, which is incorporate in the present application by reference, clearly shows “APP. A” and “APP. B” in the “server” and being in communication with the carlet application (502) in the “client”. Also see, Page 16, lines 23-24 (*carlet application is a MP3 player...*).

2. Page 17, lines 12-13 of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/104,267, which is incorporated in the present application by reference. (*“As such, a connection over any one channel will be transparent to the carlet on the client side and the application on the server side”*).

3. Figure 7 of the present application. Page 12, line 3 of the Applicants’ Specification.

4. Figure 3 showing a client-server communication.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112 2nd paragraph

In the Office Action mailed on December 26, 2007, claim 19 was rejected under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph.

Claim 19 have been amended to rectify indefiniteness, as pointed out by the Examiner, in the claim. The Office is requested to withdraw the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

In the Office Action mailed on December 26, 2007, rejection of claims 1, 9, and, 14 under 35 USC 103(a) was held in abeyance due to rejections under 35 USC 112. This rejection is respectfully traversed and the arguments presented in the amendment filed on October 22, 2007 are hereby incorporated by reference.

The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims and allowance of all claims now presented.

Conclusion

In view of these clarifying claims, the Applicants submit that the cited reference does not suggest the recited elements.

The Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present Amendment, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 774-6927.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No.SUNMP178). If a telephone interview would in any way expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 408-774-6927.

Respectfully submitted,

Martine Penilla & Gencarella, LLP

/Rajeev Madnawat/

Dated: January 17, 2008

Rajeev Madnawat
Reg. No. 57, 190

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, CA 94085
Tel: (408) 749-6900
Fax: (408) 749-6901
Customer Number: 32291